arXiv:1612.09068v1 [math.RA] 29 Dec 2016

NOTES ON PRIME NEAR-RINGS WITH MULTIPLICATIVE DERIVATION

ÖZNUR GÖLBAŞI AND ZELIHA BEDIR

ABSTRACT. Let N be a left near ring. A map $d : R \to R$ is called a nonzero multiplicative derivation if $d(xy) = xd(y) + d(x)y$ holds for all $x, y \in R$. In the present paper, we shall extend some well known results concerning commutativity of prime rings for a nonzero multiplicative derivations of a left prime near-ring N.

1. INTRODUCTION

An additively written group $(N, +)$ equipped with a binary operation $. : N \to N, (x, y) \to xy$, such that $x(yz) = (xy)z$ and $x(y + z) = xy + xz$ for all $x, y, z \in N$ is called a left near-ring. A near-ring N is called zero symmetric if $0x = 0$ for all $x \in N$ (recall that left distributive yields $x0 = 0$). A near-ring N is said to be $3-$prime if $xNy = \{0\}$ implies $x = 0$ or $y = 0$. For any $x, y \in N$, as usual $[x, y] = xy - yx$ and $xoy = xy + yx$ will denote the well-known Lie and Jordan products respectively. The set $Z = \{x \in N \mid yx = xy \text{ for all } y \in N\}$ is called multiplicative center of N. A mapping $d : N \to N$ is said to be a derivation if $d(xy) = xd(y) + d(x)y$ for all $x, y \in N$. N is said to be $2-$torsion free if $x \in N$ and $x + x = 0$ implies $x = 0$.

Since E. C. Posner published his paper [9] in 1957, many authors have investigated properties of derivations of prime and semiprime rings. The study of derivations of near-rings was initiated by H. E. Bell and G. Mason in 1987 [1]. There has been a great deal of work concerning commutativity of prime and semiprime rings and near-rings with derivations satisfying with certain differantial identities. (see refererences for a partial bibliography).

Herstein has proved that if R is a prime ring of characteristic different from 2 and if d is a nonzero derivation such that $d(R) \subseteq Z$, then R is commutative in [7]. In [3], H. E. Bell and L. C. Kappe have proved that d is a derivation of R which is either an homomorphism or anti-homomorphism in semiprime ring R or a nonzero right ideal of R then $d = 0$. In [5], Daif and Bell proved that R is semiprime ring, U is a nonzero ideal of R and d is a derivation of R such that $d([x, y]) = \pm[x, y]$, for all $x, y \in U$, then $U \subseteq Z$. These results were extended to near rings.

In [4], the notion of multiplicative derivation was introduced by Daif motivated by Martindale in [8]. $d : R \to R$ is called a multiplicative derivation if $d(xy) = xd(y) + d(x)y$ holds for all $x, y \in R$. These maps are not additive. In [6], Goldman and Semrl gave the complete description of these maps. We have $R = C[0, 1]$, the

[1]2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 16Y30, 16W25.
[2]Keywords and Phrases: prime ring, near-ring, derivation, multiplicative derivation.

ring of all continuous (real or complex valued) functions and define a map $d : R \to R$ such as

$$d(f)(x) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} f(x)\log|f(x)|, & f(x) \neq 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{array} \right\}.$$

It is clear that d is multiplicative derivation, but d is not additive. In view of some results it is natural to look for comparable results with multiplicative derivations of near-rings. In the present paper, we shall extend above mentioned results for multiplicative derivations of a zero symmetric 3−prime near-ring N.

2. Results

Lemma 1. [2, Lemma 1.2]*Let N be a 3−prime near-ring.*

(i) If $z \in Z\backslash\{0\}$, then z is not a zero divisor.

(ii) If Z contains a nonzero element z for which $z + z \in Z$, then $(N, +)$ is abelian.

(iii) If $z \in Z\backslash\{0\}$ and $x \in N$ such that *$xz \in Z$* or *$zx \in Z$, then $x \in Z$.*

Lemma 2. *Let N be a near-ring and $d : N \to N$ multiplicative derivation of N. Then*

$$(xd(y) + d(x)y)z = xd(y)z + d(x)yz, \text{ for all } x, y, z \in N.$$

Proof. By calculating $d(xyz)$ in two different ways, we see that

$$d((xy)z) = xyd(z) + d(xy)z$$

and

$$d(x(yz)) = xyd(z) + xd(y)z + d(x)yz.$$

Hence we have

$$(xd(y) + d(x)y)z = xd(y)z + d(x)yz, \text{ for all } x, y, z \in N.$$

□

Lemma 3. *Let N be a 3−prime near-ring and $a \in N$. If N admits a nonzero multiplicative derivation d such that $d(N)a = 0$ (or $ad(N) = 0$), then $a = 0$.*

Proof. By the hypothesis, we get

$$d(xy)a = 0, \text{ for all } x, y \in N.$$

Expanding this equation and using the hypothesis, we have

$$d(x)Na = 0, \text{ for all } x \in N.$$

Since N is 3−prime near-ring and $d \neq 0$, we obtain that $a = 0$.

$ad(N) = 0$ can be proved by using the same techniques. □

Theorem 1. *Let N be a 3−prime near-ring. If N admits a nonzero multiplicative derivation d such that $d(N) \subseteq Z$, then N is a commutative ring.*

Proof. For any $x, y \in N$, we get $d(xy) \in Z$, and so

$$d(xy)y = yd(xy).$$

That is

$$(xd(y) + d(x)y)y = y(xd(y) + d(x)y).$$

Using Lemma 2, we get

$$xd(y)y + d(x)yy = yxd(y) + yd(x)y.$$

Since $d(N) \subseteq Z$, we arrive at

$$d(y)xy + d(x)yy = d(y)yx + d(x)yy,$$

and so

$$d(y)[x, y] = 0.$$

Using Lemma 1 (i), we have for each fixed $y \in N$ either $d(y) = 0$ or $y \in Z$.

Now, we assume $d(y) = 0$. For any $x \in N$, we have $d(xy) \in Z$ by the hypothesis. Since $d(y) = 0$, we get $d(xy) = d(x)y \in Z$, for all $x \in N$. By Lemma 1 (iii), we get $d(x) = 0$, for all $x \in N$ or $y \in Z$. Since $d \neq 0$, we must have $y \in Z$. Hence we arrive at $y \in Z$ for any cases. That is $N \subseteq Z$, and so N is commutative near-ring. Hence N has right distubituve.

Now we show that $(N, +)$ is abelian.

It is clear that $N^2 \neq (0)$. So, we get $0 \neq xy \in N^2$. We know that $xy \in N \subseteq Z$. Hence $xy \in Z\backslash\{0\}$. On the other hand, $xy + xy = x(y + y) \in N \subseteq Z$. Using Lemma 1 (ii), we arrive at $(N, +)$ is abelian. Thus N is a commutative ring. □

Theorem 2. *Let N be a $3-$prime near-ring and d a nonzero multiplicative derivation of N such that $d([x, y]) = 0$, for all $x, y \in N$, then N is a commutative ring.*

Proof. We have

$$d([x, y]) = 0, \text{ for all } x, y \in N. \tag{2.1}$$

Writing xy instead of y in (2.1) and using this equation, we get

$$0 = d([x, xy]) = d(x[x, y]) = xd([x, y]) + d(x)[x, y],$$

and so

$$d(x)[x, y] = 0, \text{ for all } x, y \in N, \tag{2.2}$$

or equivalently

$$d(x)xy = d(x)yx, \text{ for all } x, y \in N. \tag{2.3}$$

Replacing y by yz in (2.3) and using this equation, we have

$$d(x)xyz = d(x)yzx$$
$$d(x)yxz = d(x)yzx,$$

and so

$$d(x)N[x, z] = 0, \text{ for all } x, z \in N.$$

This yields that

$$d(x) = 0 \text{ or } x \in Z. \tag{2.4}$$

Now we get $x \in N$ such that $x \notin Z$. Thus we have $d(x) = 0$ by (2.4). For any $y \in N$, $d(xy) \neq 0$. In fact, if $d(xy) = 0$, then $0 = d(xy) = xd(y) + d(x)y = xd(y)$, and so $xd(N) = 0$. By Lemma 3, we get $x = 0$, and so $x \in Z$, a contradiction. So we must have $d(xy) \neq 0$ for any $y \in N$. Hence $xy \in Z$ by (2.4). This implies $(xy)z \in Z$ for all $y, z \in N$. By Lemma 1 (iii), we arrive at

$$xy = 0, \text{ for all } y \in N \text{ or } z \in Z, \text{ for all } z \in N.$$

That is

$$xN = 0 \text{ or } N \subseteq Z.$$

If $xN = 0$, then $x = 0$, and so $x \in Z$, a contradiction. So, we find that $N \subseteq Z$.

Hence if we return (2.4), we arrive at $N \subseteq Z$ for any cases. Thus N is commutative near-ring, and so N has right distubituve.

Using the same arguments in the last paragraph of the proof of Theorem 1, we can show that $(N, +)$ is abelian. Thus N is a commutative ring. The proof is completed. □

Theorem 3. *Let N be a $3-$prime near-ring and d a nonzero multiplicative derivation of N such that $d([x, y]) = \pm[x, y]$, for all $x, y \in N$, then N is a commutative ring.*

Proof. Replacing xy instead of y in the hypothesis, we get

$$d(x[x, y]) = \pm x[x, y]$$

Expanding this equation and using the hypothesis, we have

$$xd([x, y]) + d(x)[x, y] = \pm x[x, y],$$

and so

$$d(x)[x, y] = 0, \text{ for all } x, y \in N. \tag{2.5}$$

Now appliying the same arguments as used after equation (2.2) in the proof of Theorem 2, we get the required result. □

Theorem 4. *Let N be a $3-$prime near-ring and d a multiplicative derivation of N such that $d(xy) = d(x)d(y)$, for all $x, y \in N$, then $d = 0$.*

Proof. In view of our hypothesis, we have

$$xd(y) + d(x)y = d(x)d(y), \text{ for all } x, y \in N. \tag{2.6}$$

Replacing y by yz in (2.6), we get

$$xd(yz) + d(x)yz = d(x)d(yz).$$

By our hypothesis, we have

$$xd(y)d(z) + d(x)yz = d(x)d(y)d(z),$$

and so

$$xd(y)d(z) + d(x)yz = d(xy)d(z).$$

Using d is multiplicative derivation of N, we arrive at

$$xd(y)d(z) + d(x)yz = (xd(y) + d(x)y)d(z).$$

By Lemma 2, we get

$$xd(y)d(z) + d(x)yz = xd(y)d(z) + d(x)yd(z), \text{ for all } x, y, z \in N.$$

That is

$$d(x)yz = d(x)yd(z), \text{ for all } x, y, z \in N. \tag{2.7}$$

Since N is left near-ring, we have

$$d(x)N(d(z) - z) = 0, \text{ for all } x, z \in N.$$

By the $3-$primeness of N, we arrive at

$$d = 0 \text{ or } d(z) = z, \text{ for all } z \in N.$$

If $d(z) = z$, for all $z \in N$, then

$$\begin{aligned} xd(y) + d(x)y &= d(x)d(y) \\ xy + xy &= xy \\ xy &= 0, \text{ for all } x, y \in N. \end{aligned}$$

This yields that $N = 0$, a contradiction. So, we must have $d = 0$. This completes proof of our theorem. □

Theorem 5. *Let N be a $3-$prime near-ring and d a multiplicative derivation of N such that $d(xy) = d(y)d(x)$, for all $x, y \in N$, then $d = 0$.*

Proof. By our hypothesis, we have

$$xd(y) + d(x)y = d(y)d(x), \text{ for all } x, y \in N. \tag{2.8}$$

Replacing y by xy in (2.8), we get

$$xd(xy) + d(x)xy = d(xy)d(x).$$

In view of our hypothesis, we have

$$xd(y)d(x) + d(x)xy = d(xy)d(x).$$

Using d is multiplicative derivation of N, we arrive at

$$xd(y)d(x) + d(x)xy = (xd(y) + d(x)y)d(x).$$

By Lemma 2, we get

$$xd(y)d(x) + d(x)xy = xd(y)d(x) + d(x)yd(x),$$

and so

$$d(x)xy = d(x)yd(x), \text{ for all } x, y \in N. \tag{2.9}$$

Taking yz instead of y in (2.9) and using (2.9), we obtain

$$d(x)N[z, d(x)] = 0, \text{ for all } x, z \in N.$$

By the $3-$primeness of N, we get

$$d(x) = 0 \text{ or } d(x) \in Z.$$

But $d(x) = 0$ implies that $d(x) \in Z$. So, we have $d(N) \subseteq Z$. By Theorem 1, we obtain that N is commutative ring or $d = 0$. If N is commutative ring, then $d(xy) = d(y)d(x) = d(x)d(y)$, for all $x, y \in N$. Hence, we get $d = 0$ by Theorem 4. This completes the proof. □

Theorem 6. *Let N be a $3-$prime near-ring and d a nonzero multiplicative derivation of N such that $d([x, y]) = \pm(xoy)$, for all $x, y \in N$, then N is a commutative ring.*

Proof. Assume that

$$d([x, y]) = \pm(xoy), \text{ for all } x, y \in N. \tag{2.10}$$

Replacing xy instead of y in the hypothesis, we get

$$d(x[x, y]) = \pm x(xoy).$$

Expanding this equation and using the hypothesis, we have

$$xd([x, y]) + d(x)[x, y] = \pm x(xoy),$$

and so

$$d(x)[x,y]=0, \text{ for all } x,y\in N. \tag{2.11}$$

Now appliying the same arguments as used after equation (2.2) in the last paragraph of the proof of Theorem 2, we get the required result. □

Theorem 7. *Let N be a $3-$prime near-ring and d a nonzero multiplicative derivation of N such that $d([x,y])=[d(x),y]$, for all $x,y\in N$, then N is commutative ring.*

Proof. Replacing xy instead of y in the hypothesis, we get

$$d(x[x,y])=[d(x),xy].$$

Expanding this equation and using the hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned} xd([x,y])+d(x)[x,y]&=[d(x),xy]\\ x[d(x),y]+d(x)[x,y]&=[d(x),xy]\\ xd(x)y-xyd(x)+d(x)[x,y]&=d(x)xy-xyd(x). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, replacing $y=0$ in the hypothesis, we arrive at $d(0)=0$. Again replacing x instead of y in the hypothesis, we get

$$[d(x),x]=0,$$

and so

$$d(x)x=xd(x), \text{ for all } x\in N.$$

Now, using this in the last equation, we find that

$$d(x)xy-xyd(x)+d(x)[x,y]=d(x)xy-xyd(x)$$

$$d(x)[x,y]=0, \tag{2.12}$$

and so

$$d(x)xy=d(x)yx, \text{ for all } x,y\in N.$$

Replacing y by yz in this equation and using this, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(x)xyz&=d(x)yzx\\ d(x)yxz&=d(x)yzx, \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$d(x)N[x,z]=0, \text{ for all } x,z\in N.$$

This yields that

$$d(x)=0 \text{ or } x\in Z. \tag{2.13}$$

If $d(x)=0$, then $d(x)\in Z$. On the otherwise, if $x\in Z$ then $[d(x),y]=0$, for all $y\in N$ by the hypothesis, and so we have $d(x)\in Z$. Hence we arrive at $d(x)\in Z$, for both cases. That is $d(N)\subseteq Z$, and so, we obtain that N is commutative ring by Theorem 1. □

Theorem 8. *Let N be a $3-$prime near-ring and d a nonzero multiplicative derivation of N such that $d([x,y])=[x,d(y)]$, for all $x,y\in N$, then N is commutative ring.*

Proof. Replacing yx instead of x in the hypothesis, we have

$$d(y[x,y]) = [yx, d(y)].$$

Expanding this equation and using the hypothesis, we get

$$\begin{aligned} yd([x,y]) + d(y)[x,y] &= [yx, d(y)] \\ y[x,d(y)] + d(y)[x,y] &= [yx, d(y)] \\ yxd(y) - yd(y)x + d(y)[x,y] &= yxd(y) - d(y)yx \\ -yd(y)x + d(y)[x,y] &= -d(y)yx. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, replacing $y = 0$ in the hypothesis, we arrive at $d(0) = 0$. Again taking instead of x in the hypothesis, we get

$$[d(y), y] = 0,$$

and so

$$d(y)y = yd(y), \text{ for all } y \in N.$$

Now, using this in the last equation, we find that

$$-yd(y)x + d(y)[x,y] = -yd(y)x.$$

$$d(y)[x,y] = 0, \text{ for all } x, y \in N. \tag{2.14}$$

Note that the same tecniques as used after equation (2.2) in the proof of Theorem 2 are still valid in the present situation, as required. □

Theorem 9. *Let N be a $3-$prime near-ring and d a nonzero multiplicative derivation of N such that $[d(x), y] = [d(x), d(y)]$, for all $x, y \in N$, then N is commutative ring.*

Proof. If $d(x) \in Z$, then there is nothing to prove, so we assume that $d(x) \notin Z$. In the view of the hypothesis, we get

$$[d(x), y] = [d(x), d(y)], \text{ for all } x, y \in N.$$

Writing $d(x)y$ instead of y in this equation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} [d(x), d(d(x)y)] &= [d(x), d(x)y] \\ d(x)d(d(x)y) - d(d(x)y)d(x) &= d(x)[d(x), y]. \end{aligned}$$

Using d is multiplicative derivation of N and Lemma 2, we arrive at

$$d(x)d(x)d(y) + d(x)d^2(x)y - (d(x)d(y)d(x) + d^2(x)yd(x)) = d(x)[d(x), y].$$

By the hypothesis, we have

$$d(x)d(x)d(y) + d(x)d^2(x)y - (d(x)d(y)d(x) + d^2(x)yd(x)) = d(x)[d(x), d(y)].$$

Expanding this term, we arrive at

$$d(x)d(x)d(y)+d(x)d^2(x)y-d^2(x)yd(x)-d(x)d(y)d(x) = d(x)d(x)d(y)-d(x)d(y)d(x),$$

and so

$$d(x)d^2(x)y = d^2(x)yd(x), \text{ for all } x, y \in N. \tag{2.15}$$

Replacing yz instead of y in the last equation, we find that

$$d^2(x)y[d(x), z] = 0, \text{ for all } x, y, z \in N.$$

By the 3−primeness of N, we get for each $x \in N$

$$d^2(x) = 0 \text{ or } d(x) \in Z.$$

Since $d(x) \notin Z$, we must have $d^2(x) = 0$, for all $x \in N$. Writing $d(y)$ instead of y in the hypothesis and using $d^2(y) = 0$, we arrive at $[d(x), d(y)] = 0$, and so, $[d(x), y] = 0$, for all $x, y \in N$. Hence, we obtain that $d(N) \subseteq Z$, and so, N is commutative ring by Theorem 1. This completes the proof. □

Theorem 10. *Let N be a 2−torsion free 3−prime near-ring and d a nonzero multiplicative derivation of N such that $[d(x), y] = [x, y]$, for all $x, y \in N$, then N is commutative ring.*

Proof. Replacing yx instead of x in the hypothesis, we get

$$[d(yx), y] = [yx, y], \text{ for all } x, y \in N.$$

Expanding this equation by Lemma 2 and the hypothesis, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}(yd(x) + d(y)x)y - y(yd(x) + d(y)x) &= yxy - yyx \\ yd(x)y + d(y)xy - (y^2d(x) + yd(y)x) &= y[d(x), y] \\ yd(x)y + d(y)xy - yd(y)x - y^2d(x) &= yd(x)y - y^2d(x),\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$d(y)xy = yd(y)x, \text{ for all } x, y \in N.$$

Replacing xz instead of x in the last equation and using this, we get

$$d(y)N[z, y] = 0, \text{ for all } y, z \in N.$$

This implies that

$$d(y) = 0 \text{ or } y \in Z,$$

Appliying the same tecniques as used after equation (2.4) in the proof of Theorem 2 are still valid in the present situation, as required. □

References

[1] Bell, H. and Mason, G., On derivations in near rings, *Near rings and Near fields, North-Holland Mathematical Studies,* 137, 31-35, (1987).

[2] Bell, H. E., On derivations in near-rings II, *Kluwer Academic Pub. Math. Appl., Dordr.*, 426, 191-197, (1997).

[3] Bell, H. E., Kappe, L. C., Rings in which derivations satisfy certain algebraic conditions, *Acta math. Hungarica,* 53, 339-346, (1989).

[4] Daif, M. N., When is a multiplicative derivation additive, *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.,* 14(3), 615-618, (1991).

[5] Daif, M. N. , Bell, H. E., Remarks on derivations on semiprime rings, *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.,* 15(1), 205-206, (1992).

[6] Goldman, H. and Semrl, P., Multiplicative derivations on $C(X)$, *Monatsh Math.*., 121(3), 189-197, (1969).

[7] Herstein, I. N., A note on derivations, *Canad. Math. Bull.,* 21(3), 369-370, (1978).

[8] Martindale III, W. S., When are multiplicative maps additive, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 21, 695-698, (1969).

[9] Posner, E. C. Derivations in Prime Rings, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.,* 8, 1093-1100, (1957).

Cumhuriyet University, Faculty of Sciences, Department of Mathematics, 58140 Sivas, TURKEY
E-mail address: ogolbasi@cumhuriyet.edu.tr

Cumhuriyet University, Faculty of Sciences, Department of Mathematics, 58140 Sivas, TURKEY
E-mail address: zelihabedir@cumhuriyet.edu.tr
URL: http://www.cumhuriyet.edu.tr